

A new perspective on obviation from attitude contexts

Alexander Göbel and Christopher Hammerly
(University of Massachusetts, Amherst)

Introduction: Languages from the Algonquian family exhibit a morphological pattern called *obviation* which applies to animate third-person referents within and across clauses. Within a clause, at most one referent is proximate (an unmarked designation), while all others are obligatorily obviative marked. Across clauses or sentences, obviation has consequences for restrictions on co-reference: The null pronoun *she* in the Ojibwe example in (1) either refers to the subject *Ziibiins* or the object *Adikoons*, depending on whether it is proximate (1a) or obviative (1b), while its English counterpart is principally ambiguous (see Rose-Little & Moroney 2016 for a formal implementation of these effects). One common view of obviation motivated by these facts is that obviative marks non-topics (e.g. Grafstein 1984). In our presentation, we argue on the basis of novel fieldwork data from attitude contexts and particularly *attitude ascriptions* in Ojibwe that obviation primarily encodes *perspective*.

- (1) Ziibiins andawendam wii-waabamad Adikoons-an, onzaam idash ...
Ziibiins wants DESID-see Adikoons-OBV but ...
'Ziibiins_i wants to see Adikoons_k, but ...'
- a. aakozi
sick.PROX
'she_{i/(*)k} (prox) is sick'
- b. aakzoi-wan
sick-OBV
'she_{*i/k} (obv) is sick'

Data: One environment where perspective is grammatically encoded is embedding under attitude predicates like *think*. For such cases, it is often assumed that the attitude holder constitutes the default *perspective center*, the person whose speech, thoughts or feelings are being reported. However, attitude reports can come in different varieties, depending on the relation an attitude holder bears towards themselves (= the attitude ascription). Here we focus on cases in which (i) an attitude holder refers to themselves in a self-conscious way (*de se*) or (ii) refers to themselves by accident without being aware that she is doing so (*de re*). An illustration of the former—which we take to be the default—is shown in (2). In this case, co-reference of a (null) pronoun in the embedded clause with the attitude holder in the matrix clause is possible when both are proximate (2a) but prohibited when the pronoun is obviative (2b).

- (2) *De se context*
Adikoons is at a game night with her friends. For one game everyone has to draw a picture. When Adikoons sees her picture afterwards, she says, "I'm a bad artist". Later in the evening, when Adikoons already left, Makwa is talking to another friend about what happened. Makwa says:
- a. Adikoons inendam mamaazhi-d mezinibii'ige-d
Adikoons thinks bad-3 IC.draw-3
Adikoons_a (prox) thinks she_a (prox) is bad at drawing
- b. *Adikoons inendam mamaazhi-ni-d mezinibii'ige-ni-d
Adikoons thinks bad-OBV-3 IC.draw-OBV-3
intended: Adikoons_a (prox) thinks she_a (obv) is bad at drawing

However, in a context in which the attitude holder is unaware that she is talking about herself, as illustrated in (3), it becomes possible to mark the pronoun as obviative despite the attitude holder being proximate (3b). On a topicality view of obviation, this effect is not accounted for insofar as it is unclear how this change in context could affect the extent to which Adikoons is no longer topical. Rather, it provides evidence for a perspectival account. Since the attitude clause in (3b) no longer reports Adikoons's attitude, given that

